

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19, 28, 35, 36, 58, 59, and 61 were pending. Claim 17 has been amended and Claims 19, 36, 59, and 65-67 have been cancelled. No Claim has been added. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17, 19, 35, and 58-61 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi in view of Dixon and Soderlund; Claims 28, 36, and 62-67 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi-Dixon-Soderlund and further in view of Hawkins et al.; and Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi-Dixon-Soderlund and further in view of Lee.

The Office Action states that Takagi “does [not]...disclose the degree of rotation about the hinge of the device” and that Takagi “does show an undisclosed degree of rotation [which is] almost at 180 degrees in relation to both parts of the device in figure 2.” Additionally, it states that “Soderlund discloses a hinge capable of moving a display device about a hinge axis by at least 180 degrees including up to a full 360 degrees as disclosed in paragraph [0062].”

It seems to Applicants that these statements imply that the Examiner understood Claim 17 as reciting that the parts are “rotatable by 180° about a direction perpendicular to the core of the hinge axis,” not as reciting that the parts are “rotatable by at least about 180° about a direction perpendicular to the core of the hinge axis as an axis”—as shown in FIG. 5.¹ In an attempt to remedy that confusion, Applicants have amended the language in question to recite that “said display-side casing is configured to be rotatable by at least approximately 180° about an axis that is perpendicular to the core of the axis of the hinge.” However, if the

¹ Fig. 5 is intended to be exemplary but not limiting on the scope of Claim 17.

Examiner does not feel that that language captures what is shown in FIG. 5, Applicants would welcome suggestions for further amendments to that language.

Turning now to the rejection of independent Claim 17 over prior art, Applicants initially note that independent Claim 17 has also been amended to incorporate the recitations previously present in Claims 19 and 59, which were dependent from independent Claim 17, and that those dependent claims have been cancelled. However, Claims 17, 19, and 59 were all rejected over Takagi in view of Dixon and Soderlund.

Amended independent Claim 17 recites that “said display-side casing is configured to be rotatable by at least approximately 180° about an axis that is perpendicular to the core of the axis of the hinge.” This permits a user to operate the operation part while looking at the LED display panel.

In contrast, Takagi discloses a part that is openable and closable about the core of the hinge axis. It does not disclose a part that is rotatable by at least approximately 180° about an axis that is perpendicular to the core of the axis of the hinge.

As for Dixon, the phone apparatus disclosed therein is configured with a single casing. Thus, Dixon does not disclose an openable and closable part of a casing or a hinge axis, let alone a part that is “configured to be rotatable by at least approximately 180° about an axis that is perpendicular to the core of the axis of...[a] hinge.”

As for Soderlund, it discloses an apparatus having only one display part (which corresponds to the main display part recited in independent Claim 17). That is, it does not disclose a display part corresponding to the LED display part recited in independent Claim 17. Thus, it, too, does not disclose a part that is “configured to be rotatable by at least approximately 180° about an axis that is perpendicular to the core of the axis of the hinge” between a main display part and an LED display part.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that none of the three references applied to

Claim 17, 19, and 59 discloses the feature emphasized above and that, accordingly, no combination of those three references can make that feature obvious.

Turning now to the rejection of independent Claim 28 over Takagi in view of Dixon, Soderlund, and Hawkins, it is initially noted that that claim has not been amended. Instead, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The device disclosed in Takagi does not have an operation key that is operable when the casing is in its closed position.

As for Dixon and Soderlund, they do not disclose devices having casings that are openable and closable, so they also do not disclose devices in which an operation key is operable when a casing is in its closed position.

Thus, Hawkins is believed to be the key reference insofar as independent Claim 28 is concerned.

Hawkins discloses a device having only one display (i.e., the display 128). That display is an LED display described in line 38 of column 3 and corresponding to the main display part recited in independent Claim 28. Thus, Hawkins does not disclose a device having the second display part recited in independent Claim 28.

Furthermore, although Hawkins discloses an openable and closable feature of a case having a display part, an operation part, and a lid, it does not disclose a device responding to the recitation of “a hinge coupling an end of an operation-side casing having an operation part and an end of a display-side casing having a main display part with each other for pivotable movement thereof,” as recited in independent Claim 28.

Moreover, although Hawkins discloses a power switch 138 operable when the lid is in its closed position, it does not disclose that the power switch 138 can switch display contents of an LED display panel, as it also recited in independent Claim 28. In fact, the Hawkins device does not comprise “a hinge coupling an end of an operation-side casing having an

Application No. 10/574,970

In response to the Office Action dated March 12, 2009

operation part and an end of a display-side casing having a main display part with each other for pivotable movement thereof.” Therefore, it clearly does not comprise “an operation key operable in a state that the operation-side casing and the display-side casing are in their closed position,” as recited in independent Claim 28.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that none of the four applied references discloses the features emphasized above and that, consequently, no combination of those references would have made the subject matter recited in independent Claim 28 obvious.

An early and favorable action on this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Charles L. Gholz
Registration No. 26,395